

As you must know,
Sinclair
Broadcasting is
forcing their local
stations to air an
anti-Kerry
documentary days
before the election.

I am not against
the airing of such
programs, however,
as an executive
order to its
affiliates, this is
a clear example of a
powerful corporation
exercising undue,
centralized
(non-local) control
over the flow of
information that is
at the root of
democracy. Without
balanced views in
the local, public
interest, democracy
is dead. I would
ask that the FCC
step in to assure
alternative views
are expressed as
well. If ever there
was an example of
how media
consolidation and
the relaxation of
ownership rules is
corrupting
democracy, this is
it. Please ask
yourself how your
office would be
responding, this
very minute, if
Sinclair's order
involved the movie,
"Fahrenheit 911."
(Which I would
expect and demand to
be countered by an
alternative view as
well.)

Sinclair uses the
public airwaves free
of charge, that is,
my airwaves, for
which I also pay
significant taxes.
Is not Sinclair
obligated by law to
serve the public
interest? Will the
FCC enforce the law?

I respectfully
suggest that an
acceptable
compromise to this
perverse situation
would be for the FCC
to step in and order
Sinclair to offer a
documentary response
to the anti-Kerry
program. Again -
these are my
airwaves, after all.

Sinclair's actions
show why we need to
strengthen media
ownership rules, not
weaken them. They
show why the license
renewal process
needs to involve
more than a returned
postcard. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Peter Jespersen